

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	*	
	*	
Plaintiff,	*	CRIMINAL NO. 02-12
	*	
v.	*	
	*	
ROBERT FREDERICK JOHNSTON, JR.,	*	
	*	JURY INSTRUCTIONS
Defendant.	*	
	*	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Duty of the Jury
3. Evidence
4. Direct & Circumstantial Evidence
5. Credibility of Witnesses
6. Indictment
7. Definition of “on or about”
8. Presumption of Innocence
9. Elements of the Offense—Count 1
10. Agreement
- 10A. Conspiracy: Buyer/Seller
11. Success of Conspiracy Not Required
12. Conspiracy: Co-Conspirator Acts and Statements
13. Proof of Intent or Knowledge
14. Possession of Large Quantities
15. Possession: Actual, Constructive, Sole, Joint
16. Reasonable Doubt
17. Statute
18. Testimony of Accomplice
19. Impeachment of Witness: Prior Conviction
20. Witness Who has Pleaded Guilty
21. Testimony Under Grant of Immunity or Plea Bargain
22. Credibility: Cooperating Witnesses
23. Election of a Foreperson

Form of Verdict

MEMBERS OF THE JURY, THE COURT NOW GIVES YOU THE FOLLOWING
INSTRUCTIONS:

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

INTRODUCTION

Members of the jury, the instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial and during the trial remain in effect. I now give you some additional instructions.

You must, of course, continue to follow the instructions I gave you earlier, as well as those I give you now. You must not single out some instructions and ignore others, because all are important. This is true even though some of those I gave you at the beginning of trial are not repeated here.

The instructions I am about to give you now are in writing and will be available to you in the jury room. I emphasize, however, that this does not mean they are more important than my earlier instructions. Again, *all* instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, must be followed.

INSTRUCTION NO. 2

DUTY OF JURY

It is your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You will then apply the law, as I give it to you, to those facts. You must follow my instructions on the law, even if you thought the law was different or should be different.

Do not allow sympathy or prejudice to influence you. The law demands of you a just verdict, unaffected by anything except the evidence, your common sense, and the law as I give it to you.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3

EVIDENCE

I have mentioned the word “evidence.” The “evidence” in this case consists of:

- 1) the testimony of witnesses,
- 2) the documents and other things received as exhibits,
- 3) the facts that have been stipulated -- this is, formally agreed to by the parties,
- 4) the facts that have been judicially noticed -- this is, facts which I say you may, but are not required to, accept as true, even without evidence.

You may use reason and common sense to draw deductions or conclusions from facts which have been established by the evidence in the case.

Certain things are not evidence. I shall list those things again for you now:

- 1) Statements, arguments, questions and comments by lawyers representing the parties in the case are not evidence.
- 2) Objections are not evidence. Lawyers have a right to object when they believe something is improper. You should not be influenced by the objection. If I sustained an objection to a question, you must ignore the question and must not try to guess what the answer might have been.
- 3) Testimony that I struck from the record, or told you to disregard, is not evidence and must not be considered.
- 4) Anything you saw or heard about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence.

Finally, if you were instructed that some evidence was received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction.

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

There are two types of evidence from which a jury may properly find a defendant guilty of an offense. One is direct evidence—such as the testimony of an eyewitness. The other is circumstantial evidence—the proof of a chain of circumstances pointing to the commission of the offense.

As a general rule, the law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence, but simply requires that, before convicting a defendant, the jury be satisfied of a defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt from all of the evidence in the case.

INSTRUCTION NO. 5

CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES

In deciding what the facts are, you may have to decide what testimony you believe and what testimony you do not believe. You may believe all of what a witness said, or only part of it, or none of it.

In deciding what testimony to believe, consider the witness's intelligence, the opportunity the witness had to have seen or heard the things testified about, the witness's memory, any motives that witness may have for testifying a certain way, the manner of the witness while testifying, whether that witness said something different at an earlier time, the general reasonableness of the testimony, and the extent to which the testimony is consistent with any evidence that you believe.

In deciding whether or not to believe a witness, keep in mind that people sometimes hear or see things differently and sometimes forget things. You need to consider therefore whether a contradiction is an innocent misrecollection or lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood, and that may depend on whether it has to do with an important fact or only a small detail.

INSTRUCTION NO. 6

INDICTMENT

The Indictment in this case charges the defendant, ROBERT FREDERICK JOHNSTON, with one crime:

1) Count One charges the defendant, ROBERT FREDERICK JOHNSTON, committed the crime of conspiracy to knowingly and intentionally distribute 500 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841 (a)(1), 841 (b)(1)(A) and 846.

The defendant, ROBERT FREDERICK JOHNSTON, has pleaded not guilty to this charge.

As I told you at the beginning of the trial, an indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. To the contrary, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. Thus the defendant, even though charged, begins the trial with no evidence against him. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty and can be overcome only if the Government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each essential element of the crime charged.

There is no burden upon a defendant to prove that he is innocent. Accordingly, the fact that the defendant did not testify must not be considered by you in any way, or even discussed, in arriving at your verdict.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

DEFINITION OF "ON OR ABOUT"

The Indictment charges that the offenses were committed "on or about" certain dates. Although it is necessary for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that each of the offenses were committed on a date reasonably near the dates alleged in the Indictment, it is not necessary for the government to prove that the offenses were committed precisely on the dates charged.

INSTRUCTION NO. 8

PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE

The defendant is presumed innocent and, therefore, not guilty. This presumption of innocence requires you to put aside all suspicion which might arise from the arrest or charge of the defendant or the fact that he is here in court. The presumption of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the trial and alone is sufficient to find him not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome only if the prosecution proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of the crime charged against the defendant.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE—COUNT 1

The crime of conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine, as charged in Count One of the Indictment, has three essential elements, which are:

- 1) From on or about April 1, 2001, and continuing to on or about October 26, 2001, in the Southern District of Iowa and elsewhere, two or more persons reached an agreement or came to an understanding to knowingly and intentionally distribute methamphetamine;
- 2) The defendant voluntarily and intentionally joined in the agreement or understanding, either at the time it was first reached or at some later time while it was still in effect; and
- 3) At the time the defendant joined in the agreement or understanding, he knew the purpose of the agreement or understanding.

For you to find the defendant guilty of the crime charged under Count One, the government must prove all of these essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt, otherwise you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime under Count One.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

AGREEMENT

In Count One, the crime of conspiracy is charged against the Defendant. The Government must prove that defendant reached an agreement or understanding with at least one other person. It makes no difference whether that person is a defendant or named in the Indictment.

The "agreement or understanding" need not be an express or formal agreement or be in writing or cover all the details of how it is to be carried out. Nor is it necessary that the members have directly stated between themselves the details or purpose of the scheme.

You should understand that merely being present at the scene of an event, or merely acting in the same way as others or merely associating with others, does not prove that a person has joined in an agreement or understanding. A person who has no knowledge of a conspiracy but who happens to act in a way which advances some purpose of one, does not thereby become a member.

But a person may join in an agreement or understanding, as required by this element, without knowing all the details of the agreement or understanding, and without knowing who all the other members are. Further it is not necessary that a person agree to play any particular part in carrying out the agreement or understanding. A person may become a member of a conspiracy even if that person agrees to play only a minor part in the conspiracy, as long as that person has an understanding of the unlawful nature of the plan and voluntarily and intentionally joins in it.

You must decide, after considering all of the evidence, whether the conspiracy alleged in Count One of the Indictment existed. If you find that the alleged conspiracy did exist, you must also decide whether the defendant voluntarily and intentionally joined the conspiracy, either at the time it was first formed or at some later time while it was still in effect. In making that decision, you must consider only evidence of the defendant's own actions and statements. You may not consider actions and pretrial statements of others, except to the extent that pretrial statements of others describe something that had been said or done by the defendant.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10A

CONSPIRACY: BUYER/SELLER

Defendant Johnston has asserted as a theory of defense that to the extent he possessed methamphetamine, it were possessed for his personal use and consumption only. The defendant asserts that he had no intention of joining a conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine.

In order to prove that a buyer and seller were co-conspirators, the government must prove that they had an understanding about or agreed upon one or more of the alleged illegal common goals of the charged conspiracy. You are instructed that transient sales where the buyer is purchasing drugs for his own personal use and not for the purpose of distributing or delivering the purchased drugs to others does not in and of itself make the buyer a co-conspirator with the seller in the seller's drug distribution conspiracy. If, however, the buyer acquires the drugs from the seller intending to distribute or deliver the drugs to another person instead of using them for his or her own personal use, or if he or she purchases drugs from the seller as part of a continuing buyer/seller relationship, he or she may be, depending upon what the evidence shows, a co-conspirator with the seller in a drug distribution conspiracy.

In order to prove that the buyer and seller were co-conspirators, the government must prove that they had an understanding about or agreed upon one or more of the alleged illegal common goals of the charged conspiracy. In determining whether or not they had such an understanding, you may consider all of the evidence concerning their relationship, including but not limited to the frequency or infrequency with which they may have engaged in transactions, the quantities of drugs involved, if any, the course, duration, and extent of their conduct, if any, and any knowledge either had of the other's activities.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

SUCCESS OF CONSPIRACY NOT REQUIRED

It is not necessary for the Government to prove that the conspirators actually succeeded in accomplishing their unlawful plan.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

CONSPIRACY: CO-CONSPIRATOR ACTS AND STATEMENTS

You may consider acts knowingly done and statements knowingly made by a defendant's co-conspirators during the existence of the conspiracy and in furtherance of it as evidence pertaining to each defendant even though they were done or made in the absence of and without the knowledge of a defendant. This includes acts done or statements made before the defendant had joined the conspiracy, for a person who knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally joins an existing conspiracy is responsible for all of the conduct of the co-conspirators from the beginning of the conspiracy.

Acts and statements which are made before the conspiracy began or after it ended are admissible only against the person making them and should not be considered by you against any other defendant.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13

PROOF OF INTENT OR KNOWLEDGE

Intent or knowledge may be proved like anything else. You may consider any statements made and acts done by the defendant, and all the facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid in a determination of defendant's knowledge or intent.

You may, but are not required to, infer that a person intends the natural and probable consequences of acts knowingly done or knowingly omitted.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

POSSESSION OF LARGE QUANTITIES OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

A defendant's intent to distribute may be based on all of the evidence, including circumstantial evidence. I instruct you that possession of a large quantity of methamphetamine supports an inference of intent to distribute. Therefore, if you find that the defendants possessed a large quantity of methamphetamine, you may, but are not required to infer that the defendant had the specific intent to distribute.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

POSSESSION: ACTUAL, CONSTRUCTIVE, SOLE, JOINT

The law recognizes several kinds of possession. A person may have actual possession or constructive possession. A person may have sole or joint possession.

A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing, at a given time, is then in actual possession of it.

A person who, although not in actual possession, has both the power and the intention at a given time to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it.

If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint.

Whenever the word "possession" has been used in these instructions it includes actual as well as constructive possession and also sole as well as joint possession.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

REASONABLE DOUBT

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense, and not the mere possibility of innocence. A reasonable doubt is the kind of doubt that would make a reasonable person hesitate to act. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, must be proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act upon it. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. 17

STATUTE

Title 21, United States Code, Section 841(a)(1), provides in pertinent part that:

It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally to distribute . . . a controlled substance.

The term “distribute” means to deliver . . . a controlled substance.

The term “deliver” means the actual, constructive or attempt to transfer of a controlled substance and includes a "sale".

Methamphetamine is a Schedule II controlled substance under the laws of the United States.

Title 21, United States Code, Section 846, provides in pertinent part that:

Any person who ... conspires to commit any offense ... shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18

TESTIMONY OF ACCOMPLICE

You have heard testimony from certain witnesses who stated that they participated in the crime charged against the defendant. Such testimony was received in evidence and may be considered by you. You may give this testimony such weight as you think it deserves. Whether or not such testimony may have been influenced by the witness's desire to please the Government or to strike a good bargain with the Government about his or her own situation is for you to determine.

INSTRUCTION NO. 19
IMPEACHMENT OF WITNESS: PRIOR CONVICTION

You have heard evidence that certain witnesses were once convicted of a crime(s). You may use that evidence only to help you decide whether to believe the witness and how much weight to give his or her testimony.

INSTRUCTION NO. 20

WITNESS WHO HAS PLEADED GUILTY

You have heard evidence that certain witnesses have pleaded guilty to a crime which arose out of the same events for which the defendant is on trial here. You must not consider that guilty plea as any evidence of this defendant's guilt. You may consider that witness's guilty plea only for the purpose of determining how much, if at all, to rely upon that witness's testimony.

INSTRUCTION NO. 21

TESTIMONY UNDER GRANT OF IMMUNITY OR PLEA BARGAIN

You have heard evidence that certain witnesses have made a plea agreement with the Government. All witnesses have received a promise from the Government that their testimony in this trial will not be used against them unless they commit perjury or their plea agreement is broken. Such witness testimony was received in evidence and may be considered by you. You may give each witness's testimony such weight as you think it deserves. Whether or not each witness's testimony may have been influenced by a plea agreement or Government promise is for you to determine.

The witness' guilty pleas cannot be considered by you as any evidence of this defendant's guilt. The witness' guilty pleas can be considered by you only for the purpose of determining how much, if at all, to rely upon the witness's testimony.

INSTRUCTION NO. 22

CREDIBILITY - COOPERATING WITNESS

You have heard evidence that some of the witnesses hope to receive a reduced sentence on criminal charges pending against them in return for their cooperation with the Government in this case. Some of the witnesses entered into a “plea agreement” with the United States which provides that, in return for their assistance, the Government may file a motion for reduction in their sentence. Some of these witnesses are subject to mandatory minimum sentences, that is, a sentence that the law provides must be of a certain minimum length. If the prosecutor handling this witness’s case believes that they provided substantial assistance, that prosecutor can file in the court in which the charges are pending against this witness a motion to reduce their sentence below the statutory minimum. The judge has no power to reduce a sentence for substantial assistance unless the Government, acting through the United States Attorney, files such a motion. If such a motion for reduction of sentence for substantial assistance is filed by the Government, then it is up to the judge to decide whether to reduce the sentence at all, and if so, how much to reduce it.

You may give the testimony of these witnesses such weight as you think it deserves. Whether or not testimony of a witness may have been influenced by their hope of receiving a reduced sentence is for you to decide.

INSTRUCTION NO. 23

ELECTION OF A FOREPERSON/DUTY TO DELIBERATE

In conducting your deliberations and returning your verdict, there are certain rules you must follow. I shall list those rules for you now.

First, when you go to the jury room, you must select one of your members as your foreperson. That person will preside over your discussions and speak for you here in court.

Second, it is your duty, as jurors, to discuss this case with one another in the jury room. You should try to reach agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment, because a verdict - whether guilty or not guilty - must be unanimous.

Each of you must make your own conscientious decision, but only after you have considered all the evidence, discussed it fully with your fellow jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors.

Do not be afraid to change your opinions if the discussion persuades you that you should. But do not come to a decision simply because other jurors think it is right, or simply to reach a verdict.

Third, if the defendant is found guilty, the sentence to be imposed is my responsibility. You may not consider punishment in any way in deciding whether the Government has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Fourth, if you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, you may send a note to me through the marshal or bailiff, signed by one or more jurors. I will respond as soon as possible either in writing or orally in open court. Remember that you should not tell anyone - including me - how your votes stand numerically.

Fifth, your verdict must be based solely on the evidence and on the law which I have given to you in my instructions. The verdict whether guilty or not guilty must be unanimous. Nothing I have said or done is intended to suggest what your verdict should be - that is entirely for you to decide.

Finally, the verdict form is simply the written notice of the decision that you reach in this case. [The form reads: (read form)]. You will take this form to the jury room, and when each of you has agreed on the verdicts, your foreperson will fill in the form, sign and date it, and advise the marshal or court security officer that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

September 25, 2002

DATE



ROBERT W. PRATT
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE